

**REMARKS****INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-38 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claim 39 is added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-39 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 13-23, 26, 28, 33, and 34 are amended herein.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview of May 12, 2005. During the interview the Applicant and the Examiner discussed the outstanding rejections and objections. It was agreed during the interview that claim amendments herein would resolve some of the rejections. The Examiner agreed at the interview that the § 101 rejection of claims 23-27 was mistaken and would be withdrawn.

**OBJECTIONS: INFORMALITIES**

Claim 1 and 13 were objected to due to informalities which are corrected herein. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 09/436,618  
Attorney Docket Number: 129990.01  
Filing Date: November 9, 1999

13/17

**REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph for reasons stated in the Office Action. For reasons presented below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-38 were rejected because of confusion over whether the term "server" was redefined in the specification. The specification mentions "[a] server defines one or more computer-executable functions ..." (page 6, lines 4-5). According to the Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, "define" is sometimes used to mean "to fix or mark the limits of". The specification does not use the term "define" to redefine the term "server", but rather uses the term "define" to state what a server may be comprised of. As shown by the examples at page 6, lines 5-7 of the specification, a server is simply a unit of functionality. See also Figure 5, and page 12, which mentions that a "server performs a task" (line 10), and "the functions defined in the server are performed ..." (lines 16-17). For clarity and without changing the scope of the claims, the phrase "server defines" has been changed to "server comprises".

Claims 1, 13, 23, and 26 were rejected due the recitation of "optimized". This limitation has been deleted. In relation to "optimized", the claims were rejected due to the recitation of "manipulating". The relevant claim elements have been rearranged for clarity.

Claims 1, 13, 23, and 26 were rejected due to the recitation that servers "execute in cache". Applicant respectfully submits that "execute in cache" means that the server (or perhaps a part thereof) resides in cache while executing therefrom. It is well known in the art that a cache can store instructions. See, for example, page 13, lines 10-11 of the specification. However, for clarity the "execute in cache" feature has been removed. Furthermore, "execute with the user context data and the global data stored" has been

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 09/436,618  
Attorney Docket Number: 129990.01  
Filing Date: November 9, 1999

14/17

added not as a new limitation but rather as a restatement of the previously recited feature that "global data in cache is given priority over user context data in cache".

Claims 7, 8, 19, and 33-34 were rejected due to confusion about the relationship between a node and the data associated with a node. The specification refers to an exemplary node as containing data such as pointers (page 2, line 15 and lines 19-20) and descriptors (page 3, lines 2-4). For clarity, the claims have been amended to state that a node contains node data.

Claim 28 was rejected for being phrased in such a way as to present what should be an independent claim as a dependent claim. The original claim 28 specified a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1. The claim has been rewritten as an independent claim that incorporates the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 8 and 34 were rejected for lack of antecedent basis with respect to the term "the cached node". These claims have been amended to clarify the use of this term without changing the scope of the claims.

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 101

At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 13-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 101. Claims 13-22 have been amended into the form of a computer-readable medium. The Examiner agreed at the interview that the § 101 rejection of claims 23-27 was mistaken and would be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 09/436,618  
Attorney Docket Number: 129990.01  
Filing Date: November 9, 1999

15/17

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above it is submitted that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the subject Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this Amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 09/436,618  
Attorney Docket Number: 129990.01  
Filing Date: November 9, 1999

16/17

If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Amendment, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 1 JUNE 2005

By: James T. Strom

James T. Strom, 48,702  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (425) 706-0362  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306.

06-01-05

Date

Sherry Smith

Signature

Sherry Smith

Type or Print Name

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 09/436,618  
Attorney Docket Number: 129990.01  
Filing Date: November 9, 1999

7/17

BEST AVAILABLE COPY